DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 273 698 UD 025 066

AUTHOR Hawley, Willis D.; Rosenholtz, Susan J.
TITLE Achieving Quality Integrated Education.
INSTITUTION National Education Association, Washington, D.C. Research Div.
PUB DATE 86
NOTE 38p.
AVAILABLE FROM NEA Professional Library, P.O. Box 509, West Haven, CT 06516 (NEA members $3.95; nonmembers $7.95).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Classroom Desegregation; Cultural Differences; *Educational Quality; Elementary Education; Leadership Qualities; Parent Participation; *Racial Relations; School Community Relationship; *School Desegregation; Teacher Behavior

ABSTRACT

While desegregation is neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for ensuring either equity or quality education for minorities, the evidence is convincing that it is "educationally more difficult" to improve student achievement in segregated schools. Desegregation offers the opportunity to enhance the quality of education, particularly when the definition of "quality education" extends beyond simply academic achievement. This paper describes the characteristics of schools and classrooms in which quality integrated education is most likely to occur. The conditions and practices that seem to differentiate academically effective schools from ineffective ones can be grouped into five categories: (1) teacher behavior and instructional practices, (2) leadership behavior and organizational characteristics, (3) learning environments, (4) learning resources, and (5) parent involvement. When school systems desegregate, changes occur in the community's attitude toward and relationship with schools; in addition, changes occur in the context and circumstances in which instructional and educational programs are presented. Increased attention must be directed toward parent involvement, school size, coherence of the curriculum, student discipline, the development of schoolwide norms which support achievement and order, and the other challenges of student diversity. (ETS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED273698

Association

RESEARCH

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. Felton

NEA.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Willis D. Hawley
Susan J. Rosenholtz

National Education Association

SEARCH

Achieving Quality Integrated Education

Willis D. Hawley
Peabody College, Vanderbilt University

Susan J. Rosenholtz
University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana

3 Foreword

5 Introduction

7 The Problem To Be Solved

9 Enchancing Achievement and Race Relations

11 Schools That Foster High Student Achievement

15 Implementing Effective Educational Practices

19 Meeting the Challenges of Student Diversity

29 Conclusion

31 Bibliography

Sale Copies: NEA members Stock No. 3113-X-00, $5.95
Nonmembers Stock No. 3113-X-10, $7.95

Additional copies may be ordered from the **NEA Professional Library, P.O. Box 509, West Haven, CT 06516.**

Reproduction: No part of this paper may be reproduced in any form without written permission from NEA Instruction and Professional Development, except by NEA-affiliated associations. Any reproduction of the paper must include the usual credit line and the copyright notice. Address communications to NEA/IPD Information Service.

Copyright © 1986 by the
National Education Association of the United States
All Rights Reserved

Foreword

Achieving Quality Integrated Education is one of a series of publications on equity issues by noted and highly regarded experts in the field of education.

Willis D. Hawley and Susan J. Rosenholtz describe in this paper the characteristics of schools and classrooms in which quality integrated education is most likely to occur. They prove through empirical data, and descriptions of instructional practices which promote academic achievement in integrated classrooms, that there is absolutely no evidence which links desegregation to lower test scores across the country. Furthermore, the authors maintain that their research demonstrates that minority students actually *do better* in racially mixed schools than in segregated ones; and that White students' academic achievement *is not* adversely affected in desegregated classrooms or schools.

"Little progress can be made in reducing racial intolerance and discriminatory behavior in one-race schools. 'Separate but equal' has never been a part of this nation's or any other nation's history. There is no practical or theoretical reason to believe that this will change," write Hawley and Rosenholtz.

NEA Instruction and Professional Development proudly presents this manuscript under the SEARCH title to NEA members and all those dedicated to equity and excellence in education.

Introduction

Perhaps never before has the nation been as concerned about the quality of its public schools as it is today. The public almost certainly accepts the idea that quality has declined—or, as the National Commission on Excellence in Education asserts, there is a rising tide of mediocrity in our educational system. One aspect of the critique of our schools is the idea that in focusing attention on the rights and needs of the handicapped, racial and ethnic minorities, and the economically disadvantaged, policymakers—especially those at the federal level—have not been sufficiently concerned about quality.

The belief that so-called liberal social policies have undermined the quality of our schools is deeply ingrained in the American consciousness. No policy is as culpable in the public mind as desegregation.

The idea that desegregation is largely responsible for the perceived decline in educational quality is, to be sure, intuitively sensible. There is, however, virtually no evidence to support this myth.

First, analyses of case studies of numerous school systems show that minorities more often than not achieve at higher levels in desegregated schools than in segregated schools and that the rate of academic development among White children is not slowed. Experts differ on the size of the benefit to minorities, but almost all recent analyses show positive overall effects.

Second, studies comparing student performance across a large number of schools or school systems invariably report that minority students do better in desegregated settings—or at least racially mixed settings—than in segregated ones. Again, these studies *do not* show Whites doing less well in desegregated classrooms or schools.

Third, analyses of the National Assessment of Educational Progress show increases, not decreases, in both Black and White student achievement in the South, where the greatest amount of desegregation has taken place. There is absolutely no evidence that links desegregation to lower test scores across the country.

All of this is not to argue that desegregation everywhere has benefited the children involved. On the other hand, repudiating the mythology about the negative effects of desegregation on student achievement seems essential to any effort to demonstrate convincingly that there is no necessary trade-off between equity and quality in education. Indeed, at least for low-income minority youngsters, the evidence suggests that equity is essential to quality and that equity without quality is a sham.

While desegregation is neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for ensuring either equity or quality education for minorities, we believe the evidence is convincing that it is educationally more difficult to improve student achievement in segregated schools. The evidence also convinces us that it is politically less likely that segregated schools will receive their fair share of resources—which means their disproportionate share, given the needs of the large proportions of minority children who are economically disadvantaged, handicappped, and live in one-parent families or families with two working parents.

It is possible, of course, to have minority schools that are first-rate and that outperform desegregated schools. Lest we romanticize this important fact, however, remember that research-

ers have identified such schools only by focusing on exceptions to general patterns. Sadly, there is a very high correlation between low student achievement and high proportions of minority students in particular schools.

Even if desegregation did not enhance the academic achievement of minorities, the research is clear enough that little progress can be made in reducing racial intolerance and racially discriminatory behavior in one-race schools.

Overwhelming numbers of Americans of all races and ethnic backgrounds subscribe to the importance of quality integrated education. However, large numbers of Whites and no small numbers of non-Whites believe that quality integrated education seldom occurs or that it is not likely to occur in our lifetime. Thus the task before us is to specify how the probability of quality integrated education can be substantially increased.

We have no illusions that it is easy to achieve quality integrated education. While desegregation creates opportunities for school improvement and for achieving objectives that can only be achieved in integrated settings, it requires more complicated instructional and classroom management strategies, greater schoolwide efforts to involve parents in the education of their children, and greater resources devoted to building and retaining community support, especially among persons who do not have children in the public schools.

The Problem To Be Solved

This paper seeks to describe the characteristics of schools and classrooms in which quality integrated education is most likely to occur. It draws on a review of more than one thousand empirical studies, some of which are themselves syntheses of numerous studies.

First, some definitions. Integrated schools and classrooms are those which, at least most of the time, cannot be differentiated from others in the same school system or school by reason of racial composition. This is a modest definition. The concern here is to specify effective strategies for responding to the educational opportunities and challenges posited by governmental action to bring about integration through desegregation. Implicit in the concept of quality integrated education is the idea that desegregation results in more than changes in the racial composition of schools and classrooms. The *quality* of integrated education brought about by desegregation may have many measures. We will attempt to identify those practices and conditions which—

1. Promote more positive attitudes and behaviors among students of different racial and ethnic backgrounds
2. Increase the probabilities that students will perform academically to the best of their ability.

We define academic achievement in terms of achievement on tests that purport to measure competence in the performance of skills and knowledge about traditional academic subjects. Let us acknowledge that this results, de facto, in what some would see as a narrow definition of the academic outcomes of education because there is little research on how best to promote so-called higher-order skills (such as inferential reasoning), love of learning, creativity, thoughtfulness, or an appreciation of the dynamics of human behavior and other things most people would want youngsters to learn in school. A threshold question might well be: Do the tests measure what has been taught?

Given the current propensity of many educational policymakers to put virtually all of their emphasis on improving the academic achievement of youngsters, it may be appropriate to comment on the place that goals such as improved race relations might have in an effort to improve schooling. Americans have long emphasized the importance of schools in the development of nonacademic values and behaviors that a community or the larger society feels are important to public life and individual success. Thus from the beginnings of the public school movement, in addition to academic performance, substantial attention has been given to preparing students to be self-disciplined, well-mannered toward others, patriotic, respective of authority, religious, and loving of free enterprise. Recent polls of public opinion about schools confirm the idea that Americans want their schools to do much more than maximize the academic achievement of students.

The improvement of race relations is a goal that has been added to many others the schools have traditionally pursued. Indeed, a majority of adults in a 1984 poll (65%) favored required courses in race relations; considerably less than one-third (29%) opposed requiring such courses. There is, moreover, a link between the reduction of racial intolerance and academic achievement. Presumably, we value ac-

ademic achievement in part because we see it as important to individual success, to our collective economic prosperity, and to the effective functioning of democratic government. Racial discrimination demonstrably undermines the probabilities that minorities will reap the fruits of their labors, that we will effectively utilize our available human capital, and that social policies will be just and accepted as legitimate by all our citizens.

It follows from the concern to achieve the two goals used to define quality integrated education that we are not interested in specifying the characteristics of effective "minority schools." Figure 1 clarifies the concern. It classifies schools into four types, defined by their desegregation status and their effectiveness. Schools that are predominantly or completely non-White are inevitable in many of our communities. The concern here, however, is *not* to understand the trade-offs involved in retaining segregated schools instead of reassigning students to other neighborhoods in order to end racially identifiable schools (though the issue is touched on in the conclusion). It is how to increase the number of Type I schools.

There are many schools of each type in America. Recently there has been a growing optimism about the possibility of moving predominantly non-White schools from Type IV to Type II status as a result of growing knowledge about school effectiveness. (We must be careful in our use of the term "effective schools" because it often is taken to mean separate but equal due to high academic achievement.) We share the hopes of those who are concerned with improving the quality of minority education in racially separate schools. We do not share their usual optimism, however.

Figure 1

Degrees of Desegregation and Effectiveness: Four Types of Schools

Academic Achievement	Racial Composition: Desegregated	Racial Composition: Racially Separate
High	I Quality Integrated Education	II "Separate but Equal"
Low	III False Promises	IV Wasteland

Enhancing Achievement and Race Relations

This paper makes two arguments: (1) most things that have been found to improve student achievement can be done in most schools whether they have been desegregated or not, and (2) there are ways to effectively address desegregation-related obstacles to promoting student achievement.

In the next few pages the stage is set for a more detailed discussion of strategies that will result in quality integrated education. The objective is to outline the reasons why desegregation and quality education are not necessarily computing but can, if properly pursued, result in opportunities for students that they would not otherwise have.

The most obvious opportunity desegregation can create is the potential for improved race relations. In addition, increased diversity of schools and classrooms, if such diversity can be managed effectively, can increase the range of educational opportunities many children have. Desegregation appears, too, to result in other circumstances that are likely to enhance the quality of schooling, especially for minorities. For example, between Whites and non-Whites and among persons from different backgrounds it may foster political conditions that are more likely to result in the equitable distribution of resources among the schools in a given system. However, we will focus here on classroom and school-level outcomes of desegregation.

Improving Racial Attitudes

The research on how attitudes related to race relations are changed or developed provides a consistent message: Significant and lasting change is likely only when interracial contact occurs in conditions of some equality of circumstance. Positive attitudes and behavior are most likely to occur when children are young and when interracial interactions are both structured and integral to the overall educational experience.

There is simply no way to get around the importance of interracial contact to the goals of improving interracial attitudes and behavior. What this means, of course, is that desegregation, or at least integration, is the only really effective way to significantly affect the nature of race relations in this country. However good they are in promoting academic achievement, one-race schools—those in cells I and II of Figure 1—cannot achieve one of the two goals of quality integrated education. How important this deficit of segregated schooling is depends, of course, upon the type of society in which one wants to live.

At least one study found that assigning pupils to interracial teams in the classroom was the most effective among eight practices for improving race relations among students. The practice was strongly correlated with positive racial attitudes and behavior for both Whites and minorities. Empirical studies of interracial teams across a variety of settings and structural techniques have also found that the practice improves academic achievement. Special human relations programs and multiethnic curricular materials, though not as strongly correlated as interracial teams, also have some association with positive attitudes and better race relations.

One can conclude from the avail-

able evidence that desegregated schools should employ a comprehensive program to enhance race relations. This should include schoolwide instructional and extracurricular activities. The classroom aspects of the policy would include multiethnic textbooks; role-playing projects; discussions of race relations as they occur in the classroom, the school, the community, and society; and *most important*, assigning students to interracial teams or settings to work together on class projects or otherwise creating opportunities for minority and White students to interact. The programs that are most effective are those that are integral to the day-to-day learning experiences and social interactions students have. In other words, the more integrated with other activities and the less obvious the programs are, the more integration is likely to be achieved among students.

Academic Achievement

The evidence is reasonably clear that minority children generally do better in desegregated schools than in non-White schools and that White students' achievement usually is not affected. The reasons for this, however, are not clear. There are several possibilities.

First, teachers may receive better in-service training. In the past, at least the federal government supported such training and many courts required it in handing down desegregation orders.

Second, desegregation almost surely causes many school systems and educators to reexamine what they are doing. This, in turn, may lead to changes in instruction and in other educational processes that affect achievement.

Third, teachers may ask more of students in heterogeneous classrooms, at least of low achievers. Moreover, students can both directly and indirectly assist other students, assuming teachers facilitate this.

The link between higher achievement among minorities and desegregation may also be related to peer emulation. Not all studies, however, find such influence to be strong; and peer influence within racial groups may be much stronger than across groups.

It seems reasonable to conclude that classroom diversity is a potential source of learning opportunity, the impact of which is significantly affected by how teachers organize and deliver instruction. Ways that teachers can do this effectively are discussed later.

Schools That Foster High Student Achievement

In the last few years, there has been a substantial increase in the knowledge we have about why students of the same ability or background do better in some schools than in others. There is considerable difference of opinion among scholars about how reliable all of this research is, but much of the debate has focused on a handful of studies often referred to as "the effective schools literature." This review of the research goes well beyond these few to examine the results of over a thousand studies that link or seek to link various educational conditions and practices to student achievement. Despite the fact that the research reviewed suffers from all the shortcomings of most social science research (e.g., few studies are longitudinal, all theoretically relevant conditions are not controlled, variables are not consistently specified, etc.), the school characteristics outlined below probably foster learning in most situations. However, two important and related limitations of the extant research must be noted.

First, as suggested above, this research tells us little about school and classroom practices that foster the attainment of higher-order skills. It is possible that some instructional strategies that are effective in enhancing basic skills are insufficient to promote more sophisticated types of learning and may even retard such learning.

Second, most of the studies from which the effective practices identified below have been derived are concerned with the performance of students who achieve at the middle or lower levels of the distribution of test scores.

The conditions and practices that seem to differentiate academically effective schools from ineffective ones can be grouped into five categories: (1) teacher behavior and instructional practices, (2) leadership behavior and organizational characteristics, (3) learning environments, (4) learning resources, and (5) parent involvement. The sections that follow set forth a set of propositions about each of these, and we preface them with "other things being equal."

Teacher Behavior and Instructional Practices

Effective teaching involves the interplay of several strategies which are employed in appropriate combinations, depending on the needs and abilities of the students and the learning objectives being pursued by the teacher.

First, effective teachers optimize academic learning time. This involves more than maximizing "time on task" and includes—

a. The careful structuring of physical space
b. The efficient management of time available for instruction
c. Maintaining student attention and engagement
d. Establishing and maintaining standards for student behavior
e. Giving students responsibility while structuring student tasks
f. Pacing students' work to balance successful performance and progress toward the acquisition of new skills and knowledge
g. Using "advance organizers."

Second, effective teachers utilize interactive teaching practices. This

means that they control instruction while involving students in an active search for answers. Teacher talk is balanced by student talk that is focused on the learning task the teacher has clearly in mind. Effective teaching also involves structured student interaction and tutoring within and across age groups.

Third, effective teachers reward student achievement in ways that allow all students to succeed and that tie praise to the successful performance of specific tasks. Feedback on performance is frequent and positive (but accurate). Noncompetitive evaluation systems seem more effective for most students, though there are some, especially many high achievers, who do better under competitive situations.

Fourth, effective teachers hold and communicate high expectations for student performance.

Finally, effective teachers avoid tracking and rigid ability grouping. This generalization is particularly relevant to desegregated schools, although experts differ about the effects of homogeneous as compared to heterogeneous grouping within classrooms and for certain subjects across classrooms. (Further attention is given to this issue below.)

Leadership and Organization

School leaders perform tasks and create organizational conditions that promote effective teaching and learning. Leadership can come from many people within a school, and usually does in the most effective ones. By most accounts, however, the principal is the dominant leader in most schools.

Several leadership behaviors and organizational structures promote student achievement. The first is the development of clear and widely shared goals throughout the school. In effective desegregated schools, this means an emphasis on schoolwide achievement goals *and* on positive interracial interaction. The institutionalization of goals in effective schools is brought about by (a) recruiting and selecting teachers who have work orientations and attitudes consistent with school goals, and (b) providing for frequent task-related collegial exchange within the school that focuses upon the substance of teaching as a work activity.

Second, effective principals maximize staff competence by structuring opportunities for task-related collegial exchange, continually monitoring classroom activities and student achievement, directing additional resources to classrooms needing extra assistance, and providing opportunities for in-service training specific to the instructional needs of the staff.

A third achievement-enhancing measure taken by principals is the creation of conditions that facilitate effective teaching. In effective schools, for example, principals attend to the material requirements and organization of instructional programs, provide clerical assistance for routine paperwork, and mobilize outside resources to assist teachers with routine, nonteaching tasks.

Effective principals also protect teachers' time. Because of the strong relationship that exists between engaged time and learning, instructional time is protected from frequent interruptions such as loudspeaker announcements, school assemblies, and other low-priori-

ty, intrusive events.

In addition, effective principals provide order through formalization. Formalization is said to exist where rules and procedures are specified to handle most behavioral contingencies independent of personal characteristics. Teachers act in certain ways because there is clear delineation of tasks among staff members, and all teachers are expected to behave in these ways. Formalization, then, predates any technical activity in order of priority and ensures (to the extent that rules are consistently enforced) the orderly behavior of organizational participants.

With respect to student discipline policies and practices, effective principals set clear expectations in the form of rules, directives, and specification of penalties. These policies are consistently enforced throughout the school by both administrators and other staff members. Thus formalization provides a context in which all organizational participants—students and staff—know precisely how they are expected to behave. Well-regulated student behavior places substantially less burden on the classroom teacher; quite simply, students who are orderly are significantly easier to teach than students who are not.

A fourth strategy employed by effective principals is to increase the sequential coherence of the curriculum within the school. This is accomplished primarily by joint participation of administrators and teachers in "technical decision making"—i.e., selecting instructional materials, determining appropriate instructional methods and techniques, establishing instructional policies, and so on. Participation in technical decision making (a) increases teachers' sense of ownership of and commitment to the school's instructional goals, and (b) buys them a stake in the future of a collective enterprise, thus facilitating the administrative coordination of schoolwide instructional programs. Continual student progress is less assured in the absence of a well-articulated instructional program.

Fifth, effective principals avoid tracking students and encourage teachers to use flexible forms of ability grouping. Heterogeneous ability grouping, provided the variation in ability is not too great, seems better for most students than homogeneous grouping. The effects of ability grouping on high-achieving youngsters is not clear. Such children may be slowed in their development unless teachers ensure that they are consistently challenged by new material.

Finally, principals whose actions foster high student performance link schools to parents and other sources of community support.

Learning Environments

Learning environments are created by the interaction of principals, teachers, students, and parents. They transcend particular individuals, and when they are well-established and reinforced, they take on the characteristics of a culture. Learning environments that promote effective student achievement place considerable emphasis on academic achievement and encourage students to take responsibility for disciplined behavior that respects the rights and values of others in the school. There is some reason to believe that both these conditions are

more readily secured in small rather than large schools and in settings within schools that foster a sense of community among students and allow teachers to know students well. The evidence on this last point is limited but consistent.

Learning Resources

High-quality curricula do not, in themselves, ensure high student performance, because teachers and the nature of the learning environment mediate the effects of the content of what is supposed to be learned. However, curricula can promote higher student achievement when (a) the testing program and the curricula are well-matched, (b) teachers are well-trained in the use of particular materials and believe that the curricula will aid student learning, (c) the material for any given subject (e.g., math) is substantively coherent and sequentially more sophisticated, and (d) the overall content is academically rigorous.

Electronic technology, especially the computer, is beginning to play a bigger role in instruction. Computer-assisted instruction appears to significantly facilitate student learning. Its effects on basic skills acquisition seem relatively greater for low-achieving students and when teachers are actively involved in assisting students in their use of the computer.

Parent Involvement

While research evidence is inconclusive about the effects on student achievement of parent involvement in schoolwide activities such as the PTA or advisory councils, there is no doubt that parents directly influence their children's achievement through various helping and support activities. It is also clear that efforts by schools to increase the capability of parents to assist their children—e.g., activities that educate parents to be tutors, and programs using the techniques of "home-based reinforcement"—very often have substantial positive effects on student achievement.

There is growing evidence that if parents can regulate and limit television viewing, their children will do better in school. Interestingly, heavy television viewing seems more harmful to high-achieving than to low-achieving youngsters, at least those in high school. Time spent on homework, which can be monitored and facilitated by parents, also increases student performance in school.

Implementing Effective Educational Practices

When school systems desegregate, changes occur in the community's attitude toward and relationship with schools. In addition, changes occur in the context and circumstances in which instruction and educational programs are presented. These changes create both opportunities and problems. The achievement of quality integrated education depends on the willingness and ability of school systems to take advantage of the opportunities and resolve the problems.

In general, most of the educational practices associated with high student achievement can be implemented as effectively in desegregated schools as they can in those that have not been desegregated. Desegregation-related change in the conditions of schooling does, however, appear to complicate the implementation of some of the practices that usually enhance student achievement and to require modifications in the degree of emphasis that should be placed on particular characteristics of effective schools and classrooms.

Desegregation complicates the problem of involving parents and makes it more difficult to retain smaller schools. In desegregated schools, certain characteristics of effective schools take on increased importance. These include ensuring that the curriculum is coherent and well-articulated, maintaining order, and creating schoolwide norms that support academic achievement. These difficulties and some ways they can be overcome are considered briefly.

The most significant complications arising from desegregation have to do with adapting to and taking advantage of increased student diversity. This range of problems and solutions to them are discussed in some detail in the next section.

Parent Involvement

The most obvious impact of desegregation on parent involvement is that the physical distance between home and school is increased. This means that many of the parents will find it more difficult in terms of the availability of transportation and the time it takes to get to the school for parent-teacher meetings, PTA activities, and the like. It also may mean that the school is seen by some parents as foreign territory over which they have no claim.

These problems of physical and social distance require extra efforts by schools to involve parents. This can take the form of attention to teacher-parent communications, events to help parents feel comfortable at the school, and the relocation of parent-teacher conferences to schools, churches, or other public places in the parents' neighborhood.

Size of the School

The elimination of racially identifiable schools is often easier to achieve if the size of pupil assignment areas is increased. This means that schools are sometimes increased in size because of desegregation. A common strategy is to close some schools (usually predominantly non-White schools) and expand others, or to build larger schools in areas that border both non-White and White residential areas.

If smaller school size enhances

achievement and reduces the difficulties of maintaining order, it is almost surely because (a) there are more opportunities for students to participate in leadership and extracurricular activities; (b) students are more likely to be known by other students, teachers, and administrators; and (c) problems of gaining consensus on schoolwide norms are reduced.

These conditions can be attained in large schools also if the needs they serve are attended to. Some strategies for doing this are—

- Ensuring opportunities for student participation in a broad range of school activities
- Increasing the likelihood that teachers will know students by reducing the number of different courses students might take
- "Blocking" and team teaching some courses such as math and science or English and social studies
- Assigning students in junior and senior high schools to teachers who will be their advisors while they are at the particular school
- Creating minischools or "houses" within schools
- Reducing class size so that teachers can know their students better
- Increasing efforts to emphasize achievements of individuals and groups with whom the student body as a whole can identify
- Concomitantly reassigning both teachers and students when new attendance boundaries are drawn.

Coherence of the Curriculum

While there is not a great deal of research on the importance of well-articulated curriculum in promoting student achievement, the logic of this proposition seems compelling.

The primary difficulty desegregation poses for a curriculum which builds from grade to grade on students' previously acquired knowledge and abilities and which is consistent across subject matters (e.g., writing skills being taught in English are reinforced in social studies assignments) has to do with student mobility. Even after the initial desegregation plan has been established and students are reassigned, two sources of instability recur. First, many desegregation plans involve students in attending more schools than they would have otherwise so that busing burdens can be equalized and efficient use can be made of facilities needed to achieve racial mixing while minimizing transportation costs. Second, because residential patterns shift in cities, concern with retaining some semblance of racial balance among schools may require realignments of attendance zones.

It follows that rigid triggering formulas for reassignment may exacerbate the task of achieving quality integrated education. In some communities, the school board or judges provide for realigning attendance zones where the racial composition of a given school exceeds the districtwide norm by a cer-

tain percentage (e.g., plus or minus 10 percent). Instead of using such criteria as decisive rules, school districts might use them as indicators that would result in reassignment only after consideration is also given to (a) the impact of such reassignment on the stability of both the local school and the affected schools, (b) the quality of education and race relations in the school that is "out of balance," and (c) the possibility of altering the racial mix in the desired direction by offering certain incentives (e.g., special programs) to parents who might voluntarily select the school in question for their children.

Greater attention to curriculum objectives across schools may help, though the danger here is that centrally controlled curricula may not be congruent with student needs or with the teachers' commitments and competencies. The problem can be addressed in part by focusing on goals and outcomes rather than on the particular materials and strategies, but this requires considerable attention.

Curriculum coherence can also be undermined by concern for the introduction of special "human relations"-related programs. The human relations in school services have been found to be significantly more effective when closely coordinated with the regular curriculum. In general, experts on school desegregation are in agreement about the importance of integrating human relations programs into the everyday activities of the school.

Student Discipline

Student discipline continues to be the most significant concern of parents, whether schools are desegregated or not. Also, it seems clear that this concern is heightened when schools undergo desegregation.

During the initial year of desegregation, some students are in new buildings with different expectations for behavior. When expectations are ambiguous and when they are applied inconsistently, students can be confused and sometimes angered. An increase in minority suspensions following desegregation may occur in part because minority students more often are moved into previously all-White schools than White students are moved into previously all-minority schools. Minority students are thus required to adapt to or be assimilated into a different set of rules or a different culture. The cooperative, open development of a set of behavior expectations at each school building during the initial period of desegregation and communication of these expectations to everyone in the school, including teachers, may contribute to better student discipline.

There is strong support for the idea that discipline can be promoted if clear and consistent expectations for student behavior are established and enforced, and if this is done early in the school year. In addition, parents can be enlisted in efforts to minimize student misbehavior. A very effective way is through the strategy of home-based reinforcement.

Student suspensions from school are only one way to deal with disruptions and disorder. Minority students, however, have been suspended for subjective offenses and for less serious offenses more often than their majority peers, and this can be avoided. Biracial student committees may help in preventing racial confrontations, and if a crisis does occur, they may serve as a source of trained student leadership to help mediate it.

Development of Schoolwide Norms Supporting Achievement and Order

Schools should develop a consensus about the importance of achievement and the desirability of interpersonal behavior that manifests civility and respect for others. Such norms promote academic achievement and also set the stage for good race relations. At least four characteristics of desegregated schools complicate the attainment of such consensus, however: (1) the likelihood of larger schools, (2) the fact that newly desegregated schools do not have histories and traditions, (3) the mobility of students and teachers, and (4) increased diversity of the student body.

The first three characteristics have been discussed. The consequences of student diversity are dealt with at length below. If principals are aware of the special need to attend to goal setting and reinforcement in desegregated schools, they will more likely engage in practices that might counter the difficulties of achieving what could be called a sense of community that supports student achievement and positive race relations. As noted above, these practices include the frequent articulation of goals and their reinforcement by recognition of actions that result in goal attainment, the involvement of members of the school community in goal setting and enforcement of norms, and the encouragement among teachers of the norm of collegiality (i.e., commitment to professional interaction and mutual support).

Meeting the Challenges of Student Diversity

At the heart of educational opportunities and difficulties is student diversity. From diversity comes opportunities for learning about and from others that students in socially and ethnically homogeneous schools do not have. Student diversity increases the array of instructional resources teachers have, increases teacher sensitivity to differences in students' learning needs, and probably encourages the maintenance of higher expectations for lower achievers. At the same time, diversity increases the difficulty of managing classrooms, requires teachers to employ a broader range of instructional strategies, and makes it more difficult to monitor and respond to differences in student performance.

There appear to be two types of issues to be dealt with in meeting the challenges posed by student diversity. First, how does the school provide meaningful opportunities for interracial interaction in an effort to dispel racial stereotypes and improve race or ethnic relations? Second, how does the desegregated school improve students' academic performance by providing instructional activities that are pitched and paced at the appropriate level of difficulty?

To manage a wide range of academic diversity and accompanying complexity, educators in desegregated settings frequently resort to tracking or ability grouping. Poor and minority children are disproportionately placed in lower tracks or ability groups while more affluent and White children are disproportionately placed in the higher tracks or ability groups. It is argued that the narrowing of academic diversity through tracking or grouping enhances teachers' instructional ability to deal more effectively with students.

Another frequently used instructional practice to manage diversity in the desegregated classroom is whole-class instruction. As a result of the failure of large portions of the population to acquire basic skills—especially the inner-city poor—strong demands have been placed on schools for a return to direct instruction, with emphasis on drill and recitation in the basic skills, and for a substantial narrowing of the school curriculum. Whole-class instruction is particularly reassuring to teachers in the desegregated setting: it minimizes overt interracial conflict among students within the classroom, it allows the close supervision of students' work behavior, and it seems to imply formal equity in the treatment of each child.

Despite their widespread use and appeal, there are some intended and negative consequences to both of these instructional practices that will be explored below. Tracking or ability grouping, because of the high correlation between race and achievement level in the desegregated setting, resegregates students and thus, it will be argued, greatly diminishes their opportunities for positive interracial contact. The use of tracking or ability grouping, it will also be argued, decreases the likelihood of substantial academic progress for minority children and acts in ways to confirm stereotypic beliefs about the intellectual competence of each racial group.

Whole-class instruction, with emphasis on drill, recitation, and a narrow view of curriculum, also reinforces racist beliefs. Because of the performance visibility within this type of classroom organization, minority children are likely to be perceived as intellectually incompetent. As a consequence, their effort, engagement, and participation

will be depressed. Instead of minority children receiving hoped-for stimulation to new efforts and learning, and instead of majority children learning to revise racist beliefs about the intellectual incompetence of minority youngsters, both races are unwittingly programmed for more of the same.

The Social Effects of Instructional Organization

Perceptions of Ability. The central theme presented here is that traditional school settings—those that narrowly define academic ability and make it a highly salient aspect of school life—increase the amount of stratification within them. Students' performance levels, their perceptions of their own abilities, and their perceptions of classmates' ability levels will be more highly differentiated in traditional classrooms. As a setting narrows the number of alternative dimensions of each individual's performance record, and makes those dimensions highly visible, greater global inequality will emerge and students will be more powerfully influenced by matters relating to academic ability in several different spheres of school life, including social relations.

Certain organizational conditions of classrooms combine to create a narrowly defined, undifferentiated task structure producing highly visible evaluations. Task structures are undifferentiated when all students work on similar tasks, when a small number of different materials and methods are used during instruction, and when those materials or methods are qualitatively similar. The more similar the task, the more easily students may compare performances. With high comparability, even small performances, if consistent, can form the basis for stratified perceptions of ability. Symbolically, the similarity of tasks implies a unitary basis of academic identity for students, while a diversity of tasks implies a more multidimensional academic profile.

In addition, when students work as a whole class or in stable ability groups or tracks, comparisons are made and interpreted easily. When students work as individuals or in varying groups not defined by ability, it is more difficult for others to interpret performances comparatively. Tracking or ability grouping also has symbolic meaning. When students work in explicitly stratified groups, differentiation is defined as appropriately global. Similar symbolic messages are communicated during whole-class recitation where public verbal evaluations by the teacher signal the legitimacy of comparative judgments.

The organizational conditions outlined above, when combined, describe two distinct types of classroom organization—traditional and multi-task. Variation in instructional organization has been found to affect the way students rank order themselves on ability differences within the classroom. A much higher consensus among peers and between peer and teacher ranking is found in traditional classrooms than in multi-task settings. Moreover, teachers, peers, and individual students perceive a wider range or dispersion of ability levels in traditional classrooms than in multi-task classrooms.

The impact of instructional organization is even more striking in desegregated settings. As teachers themselves have reported, Blacks and Hispanics in traditional classrooms appear to have "performance deficits" greater than those for Blacks and Hispanics in multi-task classrooms. Entry-level achievement test scores suggest that these deficits are not based on initial differences between students. Rather, traditional

classroom organization compels all class members—including teachers—to differentiate one student's performance from another's.

An ethnographic study of a desegregated school concluded that traditional classrooms made performance an extremely salient dimension in students' interpersonal evaluations. Students (most of them White) in higher-ability groups thought many lower-group classmates (who were Black) quite incapable of doing better work. When a Black child did show high performance, the child had to prove him/herself to every new class member.

Opportunities for Interracial Interaction. A rival hypothesis of equal likelihood about the harmful effects of traditional instructional organization on social goals of desegregation is its severe limitation on opportunities for interracial interaction. Most scholars of desegregation efforts point out that interracial contact is a necessary but insufficient condition for improved race relations. Unless the contact is structured in such a way as to provide equal status interaction for both minority and majority children, the argument goes, previously held stereotypes will be confirmed. While there is less consensus about precisely what constitutes equal status conditions, scholars do agree that opportunity for contact between students is an important first step.

The point to be made, quite simply, is that whole-class instruction, ability grouping, and tracking, in addition to their negative effects on students' perceptions of ability, may also provide little opportunity for students of different races to get to know each other as individuals rather than as members of social categories. It has been found, for example, that the frequency of joint intergroup interaction in desegregated classrooms is positively related to the diversity of structure and activity in the classroom. Lack of opportunity for contact, particularly when combined with narrowly defined perceptions of academic competence, is especially harmful to students' social relations in the desegregated setting. Evidence in support of this claim is reviewed below.

Students' Social Relations. What constitutes good race relations? As implied above, interracial friendship is not considered to be an appropriate measure of the character of good relations. Students group themselves for a variety of reasons (e.g., interests, neighborhood or family ties) which may be incidental to racial differences. A more reasonable definition of good race relations is a less intimate one in which there is intergroup acceptance: Black and White students liking each other or working and playing together apart from the ethnic group membership.

We know that social relations in the classroom or school are stratified, just as academic ability levels are associated. These two perceptions become linked to each other as part of the process of internal stratification.

There is evidence that instructional organization may affect school or classroom life as well. Social relations (a) are more highly stratified in traditional than in multi-task settings, and (b) produce a wider distribution of perceived acceptance; therefore (c) stratification is taken to be the proper or "natural" state of affairs.

A proviso must be added, however. This hypothesis is borne out in early

elementary grades, but the tendency of traditional settings to stratify globally—to place certain individuals at the top or bottom of all status hierarchies—may eventually create student culture reactions against school-dominated definitions of status. Students who experience traditionally organized education may come in later grades to dissociate social acceptance from ability. Studies of racially segregated elementary school classrooms support the argument. An analysis of the structure of social acceptance in classrooms varied by instructional organization revealed greater variance in the number of choices received in multi-task classrooms.

Among junior high school students, it has been found that the degree of interracial acceptance is mediated by individuals' tracking levels: the higher the academic track, the greater the interpersonal acceptance. A symmetrical cross-ethnic acceptance resulted from the high association between tracking and ethnicity, with minority students the least socially accepted. On the other hand, an urban magnet school was found to have positive interracial social relations because the visibility of low achievement was minimized, academic rewards were based on skills that all could attain, and activities were provided that maximized interracial contact and cooperation among students.

Central to demonstrating the power of instructional organization in shaping students' social relations is the problem of mutual causation. Are the most socially accepted students perceived as the most academically able, or are the most academically able students perceived as the most socially accepted? The consistent pattern of same-race social acceptance throughout the desegregation literature, coupled with the frequency of unidimensional instruction in the desegregated setting, provides support for the hypothesized relationship between instructional organization and social acceptance but does not suggest its underlying cause. Additional field research is needed to disentangle these causal explanations. There are studies, however, that illuminate the issues involved.

Intervening Against Negative Social Effects

If our analysis is correct that instructional organization attenuates or enhances cross-racial acceptance by determining students' perceptions of academic competency, their opportunity for positive interracial interaction, or both, then it should be possible to intervene against either of these structural features to produce the desired social effect. Here we review experimental interventions intended to accomplish precisely that.

Perceptions of Ability. In one study, patterns of high social acceptance and dominance for those perceived as high-ability students, and low acceptance and passivity for those perceived as low-ability, were modified by simply telling previously unacquainted students—differentiated by perceived academic ability—that a number of different abilities were required for a task they were about to perform. A creative problem-solving task was introduced and the abilities involved in the discussion task were named; for example, be-

ing able to think of new names for common objects, being able to listen to and respond to other people's ideas, and getting the group to move forward on its task. The students were told that no one was expected to be good at all the abilities and that each person could expect to be good in at least one.

After mixed-ability groups had completed the task they were given a second task to perform. Low-ranked students were significantly more active, influential, and accepted in groups that received instruction on multiple abilities than in groups that carried out the task without special instructions. A mere change in the way the situation was defined was sufficient to increase the contribution and acceptance of the low-status group members.

Cooperative Learning. A number of investigations into the effects of cooperative learning on students' social relations in the classroom have produced positive results. Further, cooperative group work has led to increased interracial interaction *outside* the academic setting when students are not working on instructional activities.

The Group-Investigative-Model (GIM) is a cooperative learning strategy for mixed-status groups. When compared with students from classrooms using whole-class instruction, students from GIM classes show more instances of interracial cooperation and social acceptance, are significantly less competitive, and when given a choice prefer working with others rather than working alone. Further, cooperative-behavior skills learned in the small group setting have been shown to transfer to interaction with peers who are not members of the same learning team.

Opportunity to Interact or Perceptions of Ability? While cooperative team learning appears to enhance the social goals of desegregation, it is less clear precisely what organizational conditions require manipulation to create more positive interracial interaction. Is simply providing opportunity for interracial interaction sufficient to produce the desired effect? Is it sufficient to use group rather than individual rewards, or is it the behavior within the group that creates more prosocial attitudes and behaviors?

Instructional Organization and Student Achievement

There is considerable controversy among educators over the consequences of ability grouping, and the research does not provide clear-cut directions for policy. Recently, however, both methodological and conceptual advances in the study of teacher behavior and student grouping at both elementary and seconday levels have produced findings that are far less equivocal. Several hypotheses derived from this literature assist in defining both research and policy issues involved in the area of instructional grouping and student achievement.

The Differential Teacher Behavior Hypothesis. One explanation for the harmful effects of ability grouping on low-achieving but not on high-achieving students concerns differential teacher behavior. That is, some teachers behave differently toward

high and low achievers in ways that induce further high or low achievement and contribute to an ever-widening achievement gap. The failure of researchers to take differential teacher behavior into account in the study of ability grouping may in fact explain the inconsistent and sometimes contradictory findings. These behaviors include the following:

1. Some teachers tolerate more behavioral interruptions when working with low- than with high-ability students. Disruptions that are produced within low-ability groups or curriculum tracks—even when controlling for students' entry-level achievement and prior disruptive behavior—reduce the achievement potential of students within the group. When students are pulled off-task because of behavioral disruptions, less learning results.
2. Some teachers require more seatwork of low than of high achievers, while devoting more interactive teaching to high than to low achievers. When students work alone, engagement rate tends to run about 68 percent; when students interact with a teacher or teacher assistant, engagement is about 85 percent. Thus, not surprisingly, seatwork is far less instructionally effective than interactive teaching.
3. Low achievers sometimes receive fewer opportunities to perform academically than high achievers, yet the frequency of active student practice where the teacher provides supportive, corrective feedback is strongly related to students' achievement.
4. When given incorrect answers, some teachers prompt high-achieving students in the proper direction more than low achievers. The guiding of an incorrect response to the appropriate answer is a teaching strategy associated with high student learning.
5. Some teachers are more enthusiastic teaching high than low achievers. Low achievers receive fewer teacher smiles and less teacher eye contact than high achievers. Teacher enthusiasm of this sort is also positively related to student learning.

Differential teacher behavior toward high and low achievers—whether grouped heterogeneously or homogeneously—can be conceptualized as a response to patterned attributions. Specifically, while high achievement is often believed attributable to the teacher's own technical competence, low achievement is often attributed to the students' lack of ability or poor home environment. This phenomenon is particularly true of teachers working with the inner-city poor.

This social pathology explanation for poor performance causes ineffective teachers not to attend to the structures and procedures that result in academic success by low achievers. That is, ineffective teachers, believing there is little that can be done to improve the performance of low achievers, act in ways to confirm their initial beliefs; while effective teachers take firm responsibility for student learning at all levels of achievement, behaving in accord with the belief that all students can, in fact, learn.

The Differential Resources Hypothesis. Comparisons of varying instructional organizations also frequently fail to specify important differences in the distribution of resources be-

tween them that bear directly on the amount and type of student learning that occurs. Resource differentials exist over such things as learning content or materials, completion time, and as indicated above, engaged time.

In a recent comparison of the learning opportunities within vocational programs at junior high and high schools serving students of varying ethnicity it was found that Whites were being directed in their vocational training toward middle-class social and economic positions while non-Whites were directed toward lower-class social and economic positions. Occupational training programs varied in two important ways to produce this difference: (1) the content of vocational courses for non-Whites centered around lower-level skills than those for Whites (e.g., clerical skills or retail sales skills versus courses in taxation and the stock market), and (2) the format of vocational courses likely augmented the content differences (e.g., programs for non-Whites were held off-campus while programs for Whites were held on-campus). Students spending considerable time away from campus, it was argued, would feel considerable psychic distance and isolation from regular academic school programs.

Buttressing this argument are a number of studies at the secondary level showing that high school students in a college curriculum track have a far greater likelihood of attending college than students in a general curriculum track, even after controlling for social background, race, sex, ability, and school achievement. Thus we see that schools impart status differences through the distribution of differential resources, with greater commitment to higher-status students.

The Differential Peer Interaction Hypothesis. Groups differ in their within-group behavior, and the differences also account for a large portion of variance in student achievement. A review of small group student interaction found that students' degrees of group helping, giving help, receiving help, and passive behavior contributed meaningfully to student achievement outcomes. Specific behaviors associated with high student achievement include the frequency of group helping (on-task interaction between individuals and members of a group), giving help (students individually give information to each other), and receiving help (directions are given or content of a task is explained by another student). The findings of positive effects of homogeneous grouping—be it ability grouping or tracking—on high but not low achievers may well be explained by this latter point.

Indeed, some of the work on cooperative learning underscores the importance of help-giving and help-seeking. Comparisons of the effectiveness of whole-class instruction versus cooperative learning for interracial groups varied by achievement level found significant achievement gains for Blacks (presumably the recipients of much help-giving) in cooperative groups but not for Whites (presumably the benefactors giving help but not receiving it). However, cooperative learning was not detrimental to the achievement of Whites when compared with whole-class instruction. In fact, consistent with the theory outlined above, cooperative learning reduced the achievement disparities between Whites and Blacks. Similar results are reported for the other cooperative learning strategies reviewed above.

Additional studies illuminate the effects of group composition and interaction on student achievement. For example, after examining group composition and interaction over time, one study reported that asking a question and receiving no answer was higher in homogeneous grouping than in heterogeneous grouping, with lower achievers the least likely to give and receive explanations. Another found that access to the incidence of help-giving and help-receiving was significantly greater for higher than for lower achievers, who, in the mixed-status group, behaved far more passively than their higher-achieving teammates. In turn, access to this valuable resource of peer assistance was a strong predictor of student achievement. It was also found that more passive students engaged in far less give-and-take interaction than more assertive students.

Taken together, these studies suggest that when higher-achieving students work with lower-achieving classmates, the achievement benefits accrue primarily to the lower achievers; when higher-achieving classmates work with higher and lower achievers, achievement benefits accrue to both; and when lower-achieving classmates work together in a group without higher achievers' assistance, achievement benefits accrue to none. These studies help explain recent findings that tracking of students by ability at the elementary school level produces the highest achievement within the high-ability classes and the lowest achievement within low-ability classes, particularly for children in desegregated settings.

A study that investigated the conditions under which students' help-seeking and help-giving behaviors arise found that children chose peers as resources more frequently than they chose teachers and were more likely to receive help when asking peers rather than teachers, regardless of the type of classroom instructional organization.

However, there were significant differences in help-seeking and help-giving by classroom task structure. Students' overall rate of help-seeking was highest within a multi-task instructional organization in comparison with whole-class instruction. Further, while lower achievers spent more time overall within whole-class instruction, the frequency of their help-seeking behavior was greatest during multi-task organization.

In review, academic competence seems to be a critical precondition to the social acceptance of students within the desegregated setting. Two organizational conditions, frequently characteristic of desegregated schools, militate against interracial social acceptance: (1) where Blacks are assigned lower academic status than Whites, which is communicated through instructional organization or teacher behavior; and (2) where lower-achieving Blacks have little opportunity to improve academically and therefore dispel racial stereotypes through task-related interaction with their higher-achieving counterparts. If either of these conditions appear, the resultant patterns of peer association will in large measure be antithetic to the purported goals of the desegregated school, in terms of both academic improvement and, subsequently, interracial acceptance.

Conclusion

Available evidence seems to lead to two general conclusions about the nation's ability to achieve quality integrated education. First, most of the practices and conditions that are associated with improving student achievement can be carried out and attained in all schools, whether or not they are desegregated.

Second, desegregation presents both opportunities and difficulties in achieving quality education. Throughout this paper there are identified dozens of opportunities that, if successfully implemented, will increase the probability that students in desegregated schools will improve their academic achievement and grow in their willingness to look beyond the skin color of people and objectively perceive individual strengths and weaknesses.

This agenda for achieving quality integrated education in desegregated schools is itself a summary, and it would be redundant to repeat the points already made. However, the benefits and costs of the opportunities and difficulties presented by desegregation are related most importantly to how well schools accommodate to student diversity and how effective teachers use and manage student differences.

Creative and effective responses to student differences do not just happen. Most experts on desegregation agree that substantial investment by school systems in staff training contributes substantially to the successful implementation of desegregation plans. The problem here is that such training costs money and is usually not very well done. All of this means that if educators are to make substantially better use of the opportunities presented by desegregation and if they are to minimize the potential costs, it is necessary to know more about how to deal with student diversity and how to train teachers to do so.

The issue that seems most critical in both these respects is where the point of diminishing returns to diversity is under different circumstances and, in particular, how the learning needs of especially motivated and academically talented students can be met in heterogeneous learning situations.

Finally, let us return to the question of whether the energies necessary to achieve quality integrated education might better be expended to improve the quality of one-race schools. The number of people who would say yes to this question seems to be growing. While the issue warrants substantial discussion, space constraints limit our answer to three points.

First, the issue is likely to be decided more by legal than by educational considerations.

Second, to the extent that one believes the inability of people of different races to interact effectively and without discrimination is a serious problem in America (Can anyone believe otherwise?), school desegregation is the best instrument we have to improve the situation.

Third, while it is possible to provide quality education in all minority schools, it is substantially more probable—for pedagogical, social-psychological, and political reasons—for this to occur in quality integrated schools. To argue differently, frankly, is not only to discount a mountain of social science research but to imagine that the conditions that have caused racial separation in our society no longer persist. "Separate but equal" has never been a part of this nation's or any other nation's history. There is no practical or theoretical reason to believe that this will change.

Bibliography

Alexander, K.L.; Cook, M.; and McDill, E.L. "Curriculum Tracking and Educational Stratification: Some Further Evidence." *American Sociological Review* 43: 47-66; 1978.

Alexander, K.L., and Eckland, B. "School Experience and Status Attainment." *Adolescence in the Life Cycle: Psychological Change and Social Context.* (Edited by S. D. Dragastin and G. H. Eler, Jr.) Washington, D.C.: Hemisphere Press, 1975.

Alexander, K.L., and McDill, E.L. "Selection and Allocation Within Schools: Some Causes and Consequences of Curriculum Placement." *American Sociological Review* 41: 969-980; 1976.

Ames, C. "Competitive Versus Cooperative Structures: The Influence of Individual and Group Performance Factors on Achievement Attributions and Affect." *American Educational Research Journal* 18: 273-287; 1981.

Ames, C.; Ames, R.; and Felker, D.W. "Effects of Competitive Reward Structure and Valence of Outcome on Children's Achievement Attributions." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 69: 1-8; 1977.

Amir, Y., and others. "Attitude Change in Desegregated Israeli High Schools." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 70: 129-136; No. 2, 1978.

Anderson, G.J. "Effects of Classroom Social Climate on Individual Learning." *American Educational Research Journal* 7: 135-151; 1970.

Aronson, E., and others. *The Jigsaw Classroom.* Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1978.

Beckerman, T.M., and Good, T.L. "The Classroom Ratio of High- and Low-Aptitude Students and Its Effect on Achievement." *American Educational Research Journal* 18: 317-327; No. 3, 1981.

Berger, J.; Rosenholtz, S.J.; and Zelditch, M. Jr. "Status Organizing Processes." *Annual Review of Sociology* 6: 479-508; 1980.

Bettencourt, E.M., and others. "Effects of Teacher Enthusiasm Training on Student On-Task Behavior and Achievement." *American Educational Research Journal* 20: 435-450; No. 3, 1983.

Blanchard, F.A.; Adelman, L.; and Cook, S.W. "The Effect of Group Success and Failure Upon Interpersonal Attraction in Cooperating Interracial Groups." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 31: 1020-1030; 1975.

Blanchard, F.A., and Cook, S.W. "The Effects of Helping a Less Competitive Group Member of a Cooperating Interracial Group on the Development of Interpersonal Attraction." Unpublished manuscript, Smith College, 1976.

Blanchard, F.A.; Weigel, R.; and Cook, S.W. "The Effect of Relative Competence of Group Members Upon Interpersonal Attraction in Cooperating Interracial Groups." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 43: 519-530; 1975.

Blumenfeld, P.C., and others. "Teacher Talk and Student Taught: Socialization into the Student Role." *Teacher and Student Perceptions: Implications for Learning.* (Edited by J. Levine and M. Wang.) Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1983.

_____. "Teaching Responsibility to First Graders." *Theory Into Practice* 18: 174-180; 1979.

Borg, W.R. "Ability Grouping in the Public Schools: A Field Study." *Journal of Experimental Education* 34: 1-97; 1965.

Bossert, S. "Task and Social Relationships in Classrooms: A Study of Classroom Organization and Its Consequences." In American Sociological Association, *Arnold and Caroline Rose Monograph Series.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Braun, C. "Teacher Expectations: Sociopsychological Dynamics." *Review of Educational Research* 67: 185-213; 1976.

Broh, C.A. "Analysis of Qualitative Literature About the Outcomes of School Desegregation Strategies." *Assessment of Current Knowledge About the Effectiveness of School Desegregation Strategies,* Vol. VI. (Edited by W. D. Hawley.) Nashville: Center for Education and Human Development Policy, Institute for Public Policy, Vanderbilt University, 1981.

Broh, C.A., and Trent, W.T. "A Review of Qualitative Literature and Expert Opinion on School Desegregation." *Assessment of Current Knowledge About the Effectiveness of School Desegregation*

Strategies, Vol. VI. (Edited by W. D. Hawley.) Nashville: Center for Education and Human Development Policy, Institute for Public Policy, Vanderbilt University, 1981.

Burton, N.W., and Jones, L.V. "Recent Trends in Achievement Levels of Black and White Youth." *Educational Researcher* 11: 11-14; No. 4, 1982.

Cohen, E.G. "Sociology Looks at Team Teaching." *Research in Sociology of Education and Socialization* 2: 163-193; 1981.

_____. "Expectation States and Interracial Interaction in School Settings." *Annual Review of Sociology* 8: 209-235; 1982.

_____. "The Desegregated School: Problems in Status Power and Interethnic Climate." *Desegregation: Groups in Contact*. (Edited by N. Miller and M.B. Brewer.) San Diego, Calif.: Academic Press. (In press a.)

_____. "Talking and Working Together: Status Interaction and Learning." *Student Diversity and the Organization Process and Use of Instructional Groups in the Classroom*. (Edited by P. Peterson and L.C. Wilkinson.) San Diego, Calif.: Academic Press. (In press b.)

Combs, J., and Cooley, W.W. "Dropouts: In High School and After School." *American Educational Research Journal* 5: 343-363; 1986.

Cook, V.; Eyler, J.; and Ward, L. *Effective Strategies for Avoiding Within School Resegregation*. Nashville: Center for Desegregation, Institute for Public Policy Studies, Vanderbilt University, December 1981.

Coulson, J.E. *Overview of the National Evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Act*. Santa Monica, Calif.: System Development Corporation, July 1977.

Crain, R.L., and Mahard, R. "Policy Implications of Research on Desegregation and Minority Achievement." *Effective School Desegregation: Equity, Quality, and Feasibility*. (Edited by W.D. Hawley.) Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1981.

Crain, R.L.; Mahard, R.E.; and Narot, R.E. *Making Desegregation Work: How Schools Create Social Climates*. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Press, 1982.

Eder, D. "Ability Grouping as a Self-fulfilling Prophecy: A Micro-analysis of Teacher Student Interaction." *Sociology of Education* 54: 151-162; 1981.

Edmonds, R. "Making Public Schools Effective." *Social Policy* 12: 56-60; No. 2, 1981.

Epstein, J. *Friends in School: Patterns of Selection and Influence in Secondary Schools*. Report No. 266. Baltimore: Center for the Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, 1978.

Esposito, D. "Homogeneous and Heterogeneous Ability Grouping: Principal Findings and Implications for Evaluating and Designing More Effective Educational Environments." *Review of Educational Research* 43: 165-179; 1973.

Evertson, C.M.; Sanford, J.P.; and Emmer, E.T. "Effects of Class Heterogeneity in Junior High School. *American Educational Research Journal* 18: 219-232; 1981.

Feldvebel, A.M. "Organizational Climate, Social Class and Educational Output." *Administrator's Notebook* 12: No. 8, 1964.

Felmlee, D., and Eder, D. "Contextual Effects in the Classroom: The Impact of Ability Groups on Student Attention." *Sociology of Education* 56: 77-87; No. 2, 1983.

Forehand, G.A., and Ragosta, M. *A Handbook for Integrated Schooling*. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1976.

Foster, G. "Discipline Practices in the Hillsborough County Public Schools." Unpublished manuscript, School Desegregation Consulting Center, University of Miami at Coral Gables, April 1977.

Froman, R.D. "Ability Grouping: Why Do We Persist and Should We?" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, April 1981.

Gallup, G.H. "The 16th Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools." *Phi Delta Kappan* 66: 23-38; September 1984.

Genova, W.J., and Walberg, H.J. *A Practitioner's Guide for Achieving Student Integration in City High Schools.* Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, November 1980.

Glidewell, J.C., and others. "Socialization and Social Structure in the Classroom." *Review of Child Development Research,* Vol. 2. (Edited by L.W. Hoffman and M.L. Hoffman.) New York: Russell Sage, 1966.

Good, T.L. "What Is Learned in Schools: Responding to School Demands in Grades K-6." Paper prepared for the National Commission on Excellence in Education, Washington, D.C., May 1982.

Good, T.; Grouws, D.; and Ebmeier, H. *Active Mathematics Teaching.* New York: Longman, 1983.

Gottfredson, G.D., and Daiger, D.C. *Disruption in 600 Schools.* Technical Report No. 289. Baltimore: Center for the Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, 1979.

Hallinan, M.T. "Friendship Patterns in Open and Traditional Classrooms." *Sociology of Education* 49: 254-264; 1976.

_____ "Structural Effects on Children's Friendship and Cliques." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 42: 43-54; 1979.

Hanks, M.P., and Eckland, B.K. "Athletics and Social Participation in the Educational Attainment Process." *Sociology of Education* 49: 271-294; 1976.

Harris, L. *Majority of Parents Report School Busing Has Been Satisfactory Experience.* Chicago: Chicago Tribune-N.Y. News Syndicate, March 26, 1981.

Hauser, R.M.; Sewell, W.H.; and Alwin, D.F. "High School Effects on Achievement." *Schooling and Achievement in American Society.* (Edited by W.H. Sewell and D.L. Featherman.) New York: Academic Press, 1976.

Hawley, W.D. *Teachers, Classrooms, and the Effects of School Desegregation on Effort in School.* Prepared for the National Institute of Education. Durham, N.C.: Duke University, April 1976.

_____. *The False Promises of Anti-Busing Legislation.* Testimony before the Subcommittee on the Separation of Powers, Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, September 30, 1981.

_____. "Effective Educational Strategies for Desegregated Schools." *Peabody Journal of Education* 59: 209-233; No. 4, 1982.

Hawley, W.D., and others. *Strategies for Effective Desegregation: Lessons from Research.* Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, D.C. Heath, 1983.

Hawley, W.D., and Rosenholtz, S. "Educational Strategies that Increase Student Academic Achievement." Paper prepared for the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation. Nashville: Education Analysis Center for Quality and Equality, Peabody College, Vanderbilt University, August 1983.

Heyns, B. "Social Selection and Stratification Within Schools." *American Journal of Sociology* 79: 1434-1451; 1974.

Johnson, D.W., and Johnson, R.T. *Learning Together and Alone.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

Katz, P. *Modification of Children's Racial Attitudes.* ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 135 882. New York: City University of New York, 1976.

Kelly, B.H. "Track Position and Delinquent Involvement: A Preliminary Analysis." *Sociology and Social Research* 58: 380-386; 1974.

Kher, N., and Brophy, J. "Teachers' Strategies for Handling Hostile-Aggressive Students." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, April 1983.

Kulik, C.; Schwalb, B.J.; and Kulik, J.A. "Programmed Instruction in Secondary Education: A Meta-Analysis of Evaluation." *Journal of Educational Research* 75: 133-138; 1982.

Leinhardt, G., and Pallay, A. "Restrictive Educational Settings: Exile or Haven?" *Review of Educational Research* 52: 557-578; 1982.

Leiter, J. "Classroom Composition and Achievement Gains." *Sociology of Education* 56: 126-132; No. 3, 1983.

Litcher, J.H., and Johnson, D.W. "Changes in Attitudes Toward Negroes of White Elementary School Students After Use of Multiethnic Readers." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 60: 148-152; No. 2, 1969.

Longshore, D. "The Impact of the Emergency School Aid Act on Human Relations in Desegregated Elementary Schools." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 5: 415-424; No. 4, 1983.

Maruyama, G., and Miller, N. "Reexamination of Normal Influence Processes in Desegregated Classrooms." *American Educational Research Journal* 16: 273-283; No. 3, 1979.

McConahay, J.B. "Reducing Racial Prejudice in Desegregated Schools." *Effective School Desegregation: Equity, Quality, and Feasibility*. (Edited by W.D. Hawley.) Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1981.

McDermott, R., and Gospodinoff, K. "Social Context for Ethnic Borders and School Failure: A Communicative Analysis." *Nonverbal Behavior*. (Edited by A. Wolfgang.) Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1978.

McLaughlin, M.W., and Marsh, D.D. "Staff Development and School Change." *Teachers College Record* 80: 69-94; No. 1, 1978.

McPartland, J.M. "Testimony Before the Subcommittee on Separation of Powers of the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, 97th Congress, 1st Session on Court Ordered School Busing, September 30, 1981." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1982.

Metz, M. *Classrooms and Corridors: The Crisis of Authority in Desegregated Secondary Schools*. Berkeley: University of California, 1978.

Metz, M.H. "Sources of Constructive Social Relationships in an Urban Magnet School." *American Journal of Education* 91: 202-245; No. 2, 1983.

Monk, D.H. "Toward a Multilevel Perspective on the Allocation of Educational Resources." *Review of Educational Research* 51: 215-236; 1981.

Morris, M.B. *The Public School as Workplace: The Principal as a Key Element in Teacher Satisfaction: A Study of Schooling in the United States*. Technical Report Series, No. 32. Dayton, Ohio: Institute for Development of Educational Activities, 1982.

Nelson-Le Gall, S., and Glor-Scheib, S. "Help-Seeking in Elementary Classrooms: An Observational Study." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, April 1983.

Neufeld, B.; Ferrar, E.; and Miles, M.B. "A Review of Effective Schools Research: The Message for Secondary Schools." Paper prepared for the National Commission on Excellence in Education. Cambridge, Mass.: Huron Institute, 1983.

Nicholls, J.G. "Development of Perception of Own Attainment and Causal Attributions for Success and Failure in Reading." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 71: 94-99; 1979.

Oakes, J. "Classroom Social Relationships: Exploring the Bowles and Gintis Hypothesis." *Sociology of Education* 55: 197-212; 1982.

_____. "Limiting Opportunity: Student Race and Curricular Differences in Secondary Vocational Education." *American Journal of Education* 91: 328-355; 1983.

Patchen, M.; Hofmann, G.; and Brown, W. "Academic Performance of Black High School Students Under Different Conditions of Contact with White Peers." *Sociology of Education* 53: 33-50; 1980.

Pepitone, E.A. "Comparison Behavior in Elementary School Children." *American Educational Research Journal* 9: 45-63; 1972.

Purkey, S.C., and Smith, M.S. "Effective Schools—A Review." *Elementary School Journal* 83: 426-452; No. 4, 1983.

Rehberg, R.A., and Rosenthal, E.R. *Class and Merit in the American High School*. New York: Longman, 1978.

Rosenbaum, J.E. *Making Inequality: The Hidden Curriculum of High School Tracking*. New York: Wiley, 1976.

_____. "Social Implications of Educational Grouping." *Review of Research in Education* 8: 361-401; 1980.

Rosenfield, D., and others. "Classroom Structure and Prejudice in Desegregated Schools." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 73: 17-26; No. 1, 1981.

Rosenholtz, S.J. "Organizational Determinants of Classroom Social Power." *Journal of Experimental Education* 50: 83-87; 1982.

_____. "Modifying Status Organizing Process of the Traditional Classroom." *Status, Attributions, and Justice*. (Edited by J. Berger and M. Zelditch, Jr.) San Francisco: Jossey Bass. (In press.)

Rosenholtz, S.J., and Cohen, E.G. "Back to Basics and the Desegregated School." *Elementary School Journal* 83: 515-527; 1983.

Rosenholtz, S.J., and Rosenholtz, S.H. "Classroom Organization and the Perception of Ability." *Sociology of Education* 54: 132-140; 1981.

Rosenholtz, S.J., and Simpson, C. "Classroom Organization and the Stratification of Students." *Elementary School Journal*. (In press a.)

_____. "The Formation of Ability Conceptions: Developmental Trend or Social Construction?" *Review of Educational Research*. (In press b.)

Rosenholtz, S.J., and Wilson, B. "The Effect of Classroom Structure on Shared Perceptions of Ability." *American Educational Research Journal* 17: 75-82; 1980.

Rowan, B.; Bossert, S.T.; and Dwyer, D.C. "Research on Effective Schools: A Cautionary Note." *Educational Researcher* 12: 24-31; No. 4, 1983.

Rowan, B., and Miracle, A.W. Jr. "System of Ability Grouping and the Stratification of Achievement in Elementary Schools." *Sociology of Education* 56: 133-144; No. 3, 1983.

St. John, N., and Lewis, R.G. "Race and the Social Structure of the Elementary Classroom." *Sociology of Education* 48: 346-368; 1975.

Schafer, W.E., and Olexa, C. *Tracking and Opportunity*. Scranton, Pa.: Chandler, 1971.

Schofield, J., and Sagar, H.A. "Desegregation, School Practices and Student Race Relations Outcomes." *The Consequences of School Desegregation*. (Edited by C. Rossell and W. Hawley.) Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1983.

Schofield, J.W. "School Desegregation and Intergroup Relations." *Social Psychology of Education: Theory and Research*. (Edited by D. Bartal and L. Saxe.) Washington, D.C.: Hemisphere Press, 1978.

Schofield, J.W., and Sagar, H.A. "Peer Interaction Patterns in an Integrated Middle School." *Sociometry* 40: 130-138; 1977.

_____. "The Social Context of Learning in an Interracial School." *Desegregated Schools: Appraisals of an American Experiment*. (Edited by R.C. Rist.) New York: Academic Press, 1979.

Schofield, J.W., and Whitley, B.E. Jr. "Peer Nomination vs. Rating Scale Measurement of Children's Peer Preferences." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 46: 242-251; 1983.

Schwarzwald, J., and Cohen, S. "Relationship Between Academic Tracking and the Degree of Interethnic Acceptance." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 4: 588-597; 1982.

Serow, R.C., and Solomon, D. "Classroom Climates and Students' Intergroup Behavior." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 71: 669-676; No. 5, 1979.

Sharan, S. "Cooperative Learning in Small Groups: Recent Methods and Effects on Achievement, Attitudes, and Ethnic Relations." *Review of Educational Research* 50: 241-272; 1980.

Simpson, C. "Classroom Organization and the Gap Between Minority and Nonminority Student Performance Levels." *Educational Research Quarterly* 6: 43-53; No. 1, 1981 (a).

_____. "Classroom Structure and the Organization of Ability." *Sociology of Education* 54: 120-132; No. 2, 1981 (b).

Slavin, R.E. "Cooperative Learning." *Review of Educational Research* 50: 317-343; 1980.

Slavin, R.E., and Madden, N. "School Practices that Improve Race Relations." *American Educational Research Journal* 16: 169-180; 1979.

Slavin, R.E., and Oickle, E. "Effects of Cooperative Learning Teams on Student Achievement and Race Relations: Treatment by Race Interactions." *Sociology of Education* 54: 174-180; 1981.

Smylie, M.A., and Hawley, W.D. *Increasing the Effectiveness of Inservice Training for Desegregation: A Synthesis of Current Research*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1982.

Spady, W.G. "Status, Achievement and Motivation in the American High School." *School Review* 79: 379-403; 1971.

Spartz, J.L., and others. *Delaware Educational Accountability System Case Studies: Elementary Schools Grades 1-4*. Dover: Delaware Department of Public Instruction, 1977.

Spuck, D.W. "Reward Structures in the Public High School." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 10: 18-34; 1974.

Stallings, J. "Allocated Academic Learning Time Revisited, or Beyond Time on Task." *Educational Researcher* 9: 11-16; No. 11, 1980.

Stallings, J.A. "What Research Has to Say to Administrators of Secondary Schools About Effective Teaching and Staff Development." Paper presented at the Conference on Creating the Conditions for Effective Teaching, Center for Educational Policy and Management, Eugene, Oregon, 1981.

Stipek, D.J. "Children's Perceptions of Their Own and Their Classmates' Ability." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 73: 404-410; 1981.

_____. "Young Children's Performance Expectations: Logical Analysis or Wishful Thinking?" *The Development of Achievement Motivation*. (Edited by J. Nicholls.) Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press. (In press.)

Study Group on Racial Isolation in the Public Schools. *School Participation and School Quality: Attendance, Suspension and Dropouts in the Cleveland Public Schools*. A report presented to the Office for School Monitoring and Community Relations and the Cleveland Board of Education, 1978.

System Development Corporation. *Human Relations Study: Investigations of Effective Human Relations Strategies*. Technical Report, Vol. 2. Santa Monica, Calif.: the Corporation, June 1980.

Tammivaara, J.S. "The Effects of Task Structure on Beliefs About Competence and Participation in Small Groups." *Sociology of Education* 55: 212-222; 1982.

Thompson, J.D. *Organizations in Action*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Tikunoff, W., and Vasquez, J. "Effective Instruction for Bilingual Schooling." Paper prepared for the National Institute of Education. San Francisco, Calif.: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1982.

Warren, R.L. "Context and Isolation: The Teaching Experience in an Elementary School." *Human Organization* 34: 139-148; 1975.

Webb, N.M. "Stability of Small Group Interaction and Achievement Over Time." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, April 1983.

Webb, N.M., and Cullian, L.K. "Group Interaction and Achievement in Small Groups: Stability Over Time." *American Educational Research Journal* 20: 411-423; No. 3, 1983.

Weinstein, R.S. "Student Perspectives on 'Achievement' in Varied Classroom Environments." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, April 1981.

Weinstein, R.S., and others. "Student Perceptions of Differential Teacher Treatment in Open and Traditional Classrooms." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 74: 678-692; No. 5, 1982.

Wellisch, J.B., and others. *An In-Depth Study of Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Schools: 1974-1975*. U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Santa Monica, Calif.: System Development Corporation, July 1976.

Witherell, C.S. "Social Relations and Interpretive Competence as the Context for Academic Success: A Case Study." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, April 1983.

National Education Association
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036